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TWO

ANTENNAE
‘Wait. We should not have to answer these questions! We have never been asked for this information before.’

- AFNORTH participant
CCA supports EBO

- Purpose of EBO
- Mission is accomplished when behavior is shaped so that intentions are in compliance
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History

- Wellington
- Modern Warfare
- Peace Support Operations, COM is the Shooter. The COM determines the message
  - Must know everything
  - COM must ensure the message is consistent up and down the chain
- C2CC’s Purpose
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C2CC

Internal CC System

External CC System

Secure e-mail perimeter
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CCA PROCESS
Six Phases of an Interactive Episode

- Scene-setting
- Build-up
- If positions agree, then Collaboration, Decision
- If positions disagree, then Confrontation then Decision
- Implementation
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Scene setting

Build-up

Confrontation

Positions may agree

Positions continue to disagree

Collaboration

Positions disagree

Positions agree

Plan is agreed

Decision

Make independent decisions to carry out plan or implement fallback strategies

Implementation

Take irreversible actions, resulting in a new situation

Create informationally closed environment

Adopt final positions within a common reference frame

Build a plan to implement common position using reason and emotion

Adopt fallback strategies; use reason and emotion to change positions and fallback strategies
Example

- Options Board showing Confrontation
- Tug of War for Confrontation
- Options Board showing Collaboration
- Tug of War for Collaboration
### COM as Shooter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>P+A</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PALESTINIANS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stop terrorism</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognize/accept Israel</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARAB STATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fund terrorism</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognize/accept Israel</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISRAEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accept “viable” Palestinian state</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raid/suppress Palestinians</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accept minimal Palestinian state</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Palestinian/Arab position = Palestinian state

Israel blocks Palestinian state

P/A do Terror

f = Terror and suppression

Israel

Palestinians

Arabs

Israeli position = Israeli domination without terrorism

P/A do Terror
### PALESTINIANS
- stop terrorism
- recognize/accept Israel

### ARAB STATES
- fund terrorism
- recognize/accept Israel

### ISRAEL
- negotiate Palestinian state
- progressively abandon settlements
- expand settlements
- raid/suppress West Bank/Gaza
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\[ r(P+A) = \text{Terror, no Palestinian State} \]

**Agreement = Palestinian state and peace**

Israel fails to negotiate Palestinian state or abandon settlements

\[ r(I) = \text{Terror, no Palestinian State} \]

Palestinians and Arabs return to terrorism and cease to recognize Israel
AFNORTH Trial

- Part of Allied Action 03 Planning Process
- Participants included 3-star General, staff including POLAD, LEGAL, CIMIC
- Training session preceded work
- Three models
Parties We Analyzed

- Friends
- Foes
- Neutrals

- All three are required to agree to achieve compliance
AFNORTH Trial Outcomes

- Success- Demonstrated need to create national/political problems as injects
- Success- Demonstrated issues overlap
- Success- Demonstrated the benefit of COM’s participation, an intention of C2CC
Insights Gained

- Don’t be too ambitious
- Adequate training of facilitator and staff is important to get the most benefit
- New processes need to be injected into the training process all along the career path i.e. difficult to do training and immediately use system all at once
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The Future

- Working with JFCOM
  - Appears that C2CC and ONA are mutually reinforcing
- Additional experiments
- Ongoing analysis
- Software and training manuals
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Legend

- Collaborative environment
- Model repository

C2CC

CCA

Formal analysis

Decisive Points

Immersive Briefing

Blue View

“Green” View

Red View

Wargaming

Critical Thinking

“Non-CCA Issues” (e.g. Logistics, Targeting)

Systems Modeling (Causal Mapping)

Plans (Resources to Effects)

Desired Effects

Formal analysis

Formal analysis

Formal analysis

Formal analysis
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QUESTIONS?

Captain Andy Baan
PSO Reminders

- COM needs to be fully informed and engaged
- Goal is to change intention of parties because mission does not end until parties realize that their desired end-state is the international community’s proclaimed end-state